

Maine Emergency Medical Services
500 Civic Center Drive
Augusta, ME

MINUTES

Human Resources & Training / PIER

June 9, 2005

- Introductions were made, the following workgroup members attended: Steve Leach; Bill Zito; Dan Palladino; Kevin Marston; Daniel Moore; Brian Mullis; Jonathan Ward; Diane Delano; Charlie Mock; Dwight Corning; Skip Stewart-Dore; and Paul Marcolini.
- The role of the facilitators, Management Intervention Services, MIS, was discussed. The facilitators are to prepare meeting materials for the workgroup. The facilitators are to keep minutes and notes and then organize and distribute them via e-mail to workgroup members after each session. They are to keep the meetings on track and focused while managing workgroup time, assignments, task lists and the agenda. They will ensure equitable and meaningful participation of workgroup members, while ensuring that consensus is reached. They are to ensure continued commitment and follow through by workgroup members. Facilitators will be responsible for preparation of status reports and the final report and documentation to the EMS project leader.
- Jay Bradshaw presented an overview of the process and the tasks that were recommended by the EMSSTAR consultants, along with the expectations of Maine EMS and the legislature. Jay advised that the EMSSTAR report compared Maine to the National Standards.
- Expectations of the workgroup:
 1. The workgroup will develop a work plan to implement change, along with a timeline.
 2. Identify funding sources to back up changes and recommendations, secure funding. Also implement changes that save money...that won't require funding.
 3. Identify alternate educational opportunities.

4. Want to see participation by all workgroup members, which will result in positive, concrete changes.
5. There must be a cohesive effort to reach consensus.
6. There should be planning within known "realities". Understand the realities of Maine EMS's situation as it relates to the State's budgetary constraints, but make every attempt to create "own destiny".
7. There needs to be a certain level of commitment for implementation, with strong follow through.
8. There should be consistency of education throughout the region. Improve sharing of information with all providers.
9. Keep a statewide perspective – no self-interest for one's particular area...no bias.
10. Protect the State System, but realize that change is needed. Minimize turf battles.
11. Improve public awareness and education. Make sure that the public is aware of EMS systems and functions. A better educated public can more favorably affect the legislature.
12. Don't reinvent the wheel. Look to other success and existing resources, particularly in other States.
13. Prioritize the EMSSTAR recommendations, "pick the low hanging fruit". Concentrate on those recommendations that will take the least effort. Show good work and progress in reporting to the legislature in January 2006. Create a 3 to 5 year action plan for implementation.
14. Beware of political realities that as process goes forward, legislatures change. Try to insure that new legislatures will react positively to the work being done.
15. Revitalize PIER
16. Better education/awareness for the public and legislators and providers.
17. Peer education of this process is important for those not involved in this effort.
18. Peer apathy needs to be addressed. The EMS community should be enthusiastic and supportive of the effort.

➤ Ground Rules:

1. Start on time...end on time. Call if your going to be late or absent.
2. Work group members should be open, honest non-judgmental and respectful.
3. Meeting length should be maximum 4 hours and minimum 2 hours.
4. Video conferencing from 3 sites is available.

5. Group size should be kept at the current number, but experts should be invited when appropriate.
6. Everyone, including the public has a right to be heard.
7. Keep the process transparent.
8. May possibly add Darryl Boucher from Aroostook County to the group.
9. Meetings are open to the public; facilitators will manage public comment time.
10. Unified front outside the room once consensus is reached. If a member can't support the groups' efforts, then they should step down.
11. There was discussion regarding what the decision making process will be. A consensus model was agreed upon. The group wants to make sure that when necessary, you draw out a point of view from a member who might be reluctant to offer an opinion.
12. The workgroup asked that some items be clarified. Do workgroups report only to the Board? When consensus can't be reached, can workgroups report 2 or more recommendations to the Board? Will the Board accept the report, or can they change and refine the report?
13. "Process Check"...any concerns that group members have can be e-mailed to the facilitators for evaluation. Facilitators will bring concerns back to the workgroup when appropriate.
14. There was discussion regarding recusing one's self from a consensus vote. Only if a conflict of interest occurs, should someone recuse themselves.
15. Disclosure statement or disclosure of interest...it was discussed that a short form with these disclosures may be required. This needs to be briefly discussed at our next meeting to implement if the workgroup so desires.
16. Discussed were the requirements for a quorum to do business and come to a consensus. It was decided that 5 of the members would constitute a quorum to meet and make decisions. Less than 5 members would be OK to discuss recommendations, but make no decisions.
17. Agendas will be set at the end of meetings. E-mail additional agenda items by a date to be decided. Facilitators will determine if an additional agenda item is appropriate for the next meeting or if it should be placed in a "Parking Lot" to be discussed at a later date.
18. Break every 50 minutes or 1/2 way during a 3 hour meeting.
19. Workgroup will meet every 2 weeks starting June 23rd at 1PM.